Remarks

In the Office Action, the Examiner stated that a reference to a prior application must be

inserted into the specification or in an application data sheet. The Examiner also objected to

claims 9 and 29. The Examiner also rejected claims 21-22 and 24-62 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as

being directed toward non-statutory subject matter. The Examiner also rejected claims 1-62

under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out

and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner

also rejected claim 1-62 on the ground of statutory double patenting. The Examiner also rejected

claims 1-3, 11, 22-23, 31, 41, and 50 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double

patenting.

In this Amendment, Applicant has amended the specification to include a reference to a

prior application. Applicant respectfully submits that the reference to the prior application was

previously submitted within the time period set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.78(a), and the information

concerning the benefit claim was recognized by the Office as shown by its inclusion on the first

filing receipt. Hence, Applicant respectfully submits this amendment to the specification without

filing a petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.78(a) and the surcharge under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(t) is proper,

as paragraph 2.15 of M.P.E.P. 201.11 provided that such an amendment is proper without a

petition and fee in cases where the claim of benefit was made through the transmittal and was

recognized by the Office in the first Filing Receipt.

In this Amendment, Applicant has also canceled claims 1-62. Applicant respectfully

submits that the objections and rejections of claims 1-62 are moot in view of the cancellation.

Applicant has also added claims 63-107. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are fully

supported by the disclosure.

Attorney Docket No.:BIOD.P0002

Client Docket No.: BDI004-CIP PTO Serial: 10/686,499

## Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that all the claims, namely claims 63-107, are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections and objections is requested. Allowance is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date.

Respectfully submitted,

STATTLER, JOHANSEN & ADELI LLP

Dated:March 21, 2007

Bum Pak

Reg. No. 39,585

Stattler Johansen & Adeli LLP 1875 Century Park East, Suite 1360 Los Angeles, CA 90067-2514 Phone: (310) 785-0140 x305

Fax: (310) 785-9558

Attorney Docket No.:BIOD.P0002 Client Docket No.: BDI004-CIP

PTO Serial: 10/686,499